CRT.ORG

ISSN: 2320-2882



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE **RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)**

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

NON-LINEAR DUAL PROGRAMMING UNDER THE CONCEPT OF B-CONVEXITY

Dr.G. Varalakshmi, PRR&VS Government College, Vidavalur

Abstract: This paper consists of various duality theorems for nonlinear programming problems under B-convexity assumptions.

- 1. Introduction: Recently Bector and Singh [2] have introduced B vex functions which are weaker than convex functions and more recently Bector, Suneja and Lalitha [8] have introduced Pseudo b vex and quasi b - vex functions which are weaker than pseudo convex and quasi convex functions respectively. P. Kanniappan & P. Pandian [7] introduced b-vexity is non-linear programming duality. R.B. Patel introduced duality for non-linear fractional programming involving generalized semilocally B-vex functions. Vasile Preda and Anton Bata to rescu [10] introduced duality for minimax generalized Byex programming involving n-set functions. But they have not considered the recently developed concepts like B-convex duality. Hence in this paper an attempt is made to fill the gap in the aim of research. This paper consists various duality theorem for non-linear programming problem under B-convexity assumptions.
 - **2.1 Definition**: The function f is said to be B convex at u \(\subseteq x. \) w.r.t.

b (\Box, u) and (x - u) if $\Box x \Box X$.

b $(x, u) [f(x) - f(u)] (x - u)^{t} \Box f(u)$

2.2 **Definition**: The function f is said to be guasi b-convex at u 2 x with respect to b (x, u) and (x - u) if 2 x 2 X.

f(x) ? f(u) ? b(x, u) ? (x, u) ? f(u) ? 0

$$f(x) ? f(u) ? b(x, u) (x - u)^{t} ? f(u) < 0$$

2.4 Definition: The function f is said to be semistrictly quasi b-convex at $u \ 2 \ X$ with respect to b (x, u) and (x - u) if $2 \ x \ 2 \ X$.

$$f(x) < f(u) \ge b(x, u)(x - u)^{t} \ge f(u) < 0$$

The connection b/u b-convex and quasi b-convex function is that every

b-convex function is quasi b-convex but the converse is not true. We can easily see that every b-convex function with respect to b (x, u), with b (x, u) > 0 is semi strictly quasi b-convex with respect to the same b (x, u). However the converse is not true.

Example: Let $x = \{-1, 1\}$ define $f : x \ @ R$ by

$$f(x) = x + x^3$$
 and $b : X \times X ? R + by$

$$(x - u) = 0$$

$$b(x, u) = -1 \times u \odot 0$$

$$=$$
 -xu, xu < 0

Then f is semi strictly quasi b-convex with respect to b (x, u) but not b-convex with respect to b (x, u) because for

$$x = \frac{-1}{7}$$
, $u = \frac{-1}{2}$, we can see that

b
$$(x, u) [f(x) - f(u)] < (x - u)^{t} 2 f(u)$$

Every semi strictly quasi b-convex with respect to b (x, u) is quasi b-convex with respect to same b (x, u) but the converse is not true.

This is demonstrated by the following example.

Example:

Let
$$x = (-1, 1)$$
. Define $f : x \$ R by $f(x) = x^3$ and

2 1 xu 2 0

$$b(x, u) = ??0, xu?0 (x - u) = 0$$

Then f is quasi b-convex with respect to b (x, u) but it is not semi strictly quasi b-convex with respect

to b (x, u) because for
$$x = 0$$
 and $u = \frac{1}{2}$.

b
$$(x, u) (x - u)^{t} 2 f(u) = 0$$
 and $f(x) < f(u)$

3 Formulation:

3.1 **Primal Formulation:**

Let us assume that the function f, g & h are differentiable on X.

Consider the following non-linear programming problem

(P) minimize f (x)

Subject to g (x) 2 0

3.2 **Dual Formulation:**

(D) Maximize f (u)

U 2 X

Subject to $2 f(u) + 2 y^t g(u) = 0 2 (1)$

$$y^{t}g(u) = 0$$
 ? (2)

$$x = 0 ? (3)$$

If f is convex with respect to bo (x, u) and (x - u) and each component g, that is g_j , j = 1, 2, ... m is b-convex w.r.t. bj (x, u) and (x - u) on x with bo (x, u) > 0, then (D) is dual to P.

4. Feasibility:

The following feasible terminology is used in duality theorems.

- (i) A point x X is said to be (P) feasible optional if x is a feasible (optimal) o solution of the primal problem (P).
- (ii) The value of the objective function for the problem (P) at a point x is called as $^{\circ}$ (P) objective value at x . $^{\circ}$

5 Duality Theorems :

5.1 : **(Weak duality theorem)** : Let x be (P) - feaisble and (u, y) be D - feasible. If f is semi strictly quasi b-convex at u with respect to (x, u) and ytg is strictly quasi b-convex at u with respect to (x, u) (x, u)

Proof: If x = u, the results is trival

suppose x 2 u

Since x is (P) - feasible and (u, y) is D - feasible, we have

ytg (x) - ytg(u) 2 0

By strictly quasi b-convexity of ytg at u

We have

b
$$(x, u) (x - u)t 2 yt g (u) < 0$$

From (7) we have

b
$$(x, u) (x - u)^{t}$$
? $f(u) > 0$

By semi strict quasi b - convexity of f at u, we have

f (x) 12 f (u)

Hence the theorem

5.2 Strong Duality Theorem:

Let x be (P) - optimal and let g satisty a constraint qualification at x . Then ⁰ 2 y 2 R m such that (x, y) is D - feasible and the p - objective value at x is equal to 0000 the D - objective value at (x, y). If forever feasible (x, u, y), the function f is semi $^{\circ}$ strictly quasi b - convex at u w.r.t. b (x, u) and ytg is strictly quasi b-convex at u with 0 respect to b (x, u) then (x, y) is is (D) - optimal.

Proof:

Since x is (P) optimal and g satisfies a constraint qualification at x by Kuhn^o Tucker condition, 2 y 2 Rm such that o

?
$$f(x) + ? yt(g(x)) = 0^{\circ} o$$

yot
$$g(x^{0}) = 0$$

y 🛭 0

(x, y) is D - feasible and P - objective value at xo is equal to D - objective o value at (x, y). 00

Suppose (x, y) is not D - optimal then 2 a D - feasible (u, y) such that 0

f(u, y) > f(x, u) 2 (4)

Then 2 a (D) - feasible and (u, y) is D - feasible by weak duality f (x) 12 f (u) 0

which is a contradiction to (4)

0 Then (x, y) is D - optimal o

Hence the theorem.

6 Converse Duality Theorem:

Theorem 6.1 Converse duality:

Let (x, y) be D - optimal and let the n x n Hersian matrix. ⁰

$$2^{2} f(x) + 2^{2} y^{t} g(x)^{0}$$
 o

be + ve or -ve definite and the vector $2 f(x) = 0^{\circ}$

If for all feasible x, u, y, f is semi strictly quasi b - convex at u w.r.t. (x, u) and yt

g is strictly quasi b - convex at u w.r.t. b (x, u). Then x is (P) - optimal. o

Proof: Since (x, y) is (D) optimal then by Fritz-John theorem $\ P \ P \ R, v \ P^n,$

q 2 R and S 2 R m such that

$$2 \text{ pf } (x) + 2 v^t [f(x) + 2 y^t g(x)] + q 2^t y g(x) = 0 2 (4.5) 0 0 0 0 0$$

$$v^{t}f(x) = 0 ? (6) °$$

$$v^{t} \supseteq g(x) + qg(x) + S = 0 \supseteq (7)^{0}$$

$$q y t g (x) = 0 ? (8) ° °$$

$$V s = 0$$
 0

$$(p, q, v, s) = 0 \ \ ? \ \ (11)$$

Multiplying (7) by y⁰, we have

$$vt ? y t g(x) + q y t g(x) + y t s = 0 0 0 0 0 0$$

From (8) and (9) we get

$$v^{t} ? y^{t} g(x) = 0 ? (12) ^{0}$$

Multiplying (5) by v t we have

$$\frac{\text{www.ijcrt.org}}{\text{pv}^{t}} \text{?f } (x) + v^{t} \left[\text{?}^{2} \text{ f } (x) + \text{?}^{2} \text{ y}^{t} \text{ g } (x) \right] \text{ v}^{00} \qquad ^{0}$$

+
$$qv^t ? y^t g(x) = 0^0$$

From (6) and (12) we get

$$v^{t} [2^{2} f(x) + 2^{2} y^{t} g(x)] v = 0^{0}$$

Since the Hersian Matrix is positive or negative difinite v = 0 since v = 0, (5)

becomes

$$p ? f(x_0) + q ? y_0 t g(x_0) = 0 From (5) we have$$

$$p ? f(x_0) + q ? (-f(x_0) = 0)$$

which implies (p - q) ? $f(x_0) = 0$

Since \mathbb{P} f $(x_0) = 0$, we have p = q

Suppose p = 0 then q = 0 and s = 0 by (7)

(p, q, v, s) = 0 which is a contradiction to (11)

Thus p @ 0, since p = q, q @ 0 and from (4.10), q > 0

Since v = 0, q > 0 and s ② 0 from (4.7) we have

g (x_o) 2 0

xo is (p) feasible. From the theorem of weak duality xo is (p) - optimal.

Hence the theorem.

6.2 Theorem (Strict converse duality theorem) :

Let x_0 be (p) - optimal and let g satisfy a constraint qualification at x_0 . If (u_0, y_0) is (D) - optimal f is strictly quasi b - convex at u₀ with respect to b₀ (x, u) and y₀^tg is strictly quasi b - convex at u₀ w.r.t. b (x, u), then $x_0 = u_0$ and inf (p) = SUP (D).

Proof: Since x_0 is (P) - Primal, g satisfies a constraint qualification at x_0 , by KhunTukkar conditions.

Suppose x₀ 2 u₀

Since x_0 is (P) - feasible and (u_0, y_0) is (D) - feasible, we have

$$b(x_0, u_0)(x_0 - u_0)^t 2 y_0^t g(u_0) < 0$$
 (13)

By the feasibility of (u_0, y_0) , we have from (13)

b
$$(x_0, u_0) (x_0 - u_0)^t$$
 ? f $(u_0) > 0$

Since b (x_0, u_0) 2 0 and b₀ (x_0, u_0) 2 0, we have

$$b_0(x_0, u_0)(x_0 - u_0)^{t} ? f(u_0) ? 0$$

By strict quasi b - convexity of f at uo, We have

$$f(x_0) > f(u_0)$$

This contradicts that (u_0, y_0) is a D - optimal.

Then $x_0 = u_0$ and clearly infimum (P) = Supremum (D).

Hence the theorem

REFERENCES

- 1. A. Ben Israel and B. Mond, what is invexity? J. Austral. Math. Soc., Series B 28 (1986), 1-9.
- 2. Bector C.R., Suneja S.K. and Lalitha C.S. (1993) "Generalized B-vex function and generalized B-vex programming", Journal of optimization theory and applications, Vol.76, P. 561-576.
- 3. Bector C.R. and Singh C. (1991), "B-vex functions, Journal of Optimization theory and application", Vol. 71 P. 237-253.
- 4. Bector, C.R., Hussain, I., Chandra, "A duality model for a generalized minimax program", Naval Research Logistics, 35 (1988), 493-501.
- 5. Bector C.R., Batia, D. and Agarwal, S. (1992) "Multiobjective fractional programming duality; A non-differentiable case", Congressus Numeration, 87, 77-85.
- 6. Bector, C.R., Singh, M. and Gill, A. (1993): "Duality for vector valued B-vex
- P. Mazzoleni: "On constrained optimization for convex set function in survey of mathematical programming" Vol.1, A. Pre Kopaled, North Holland, Amsterdam (1979), 273290.
- 7. P. Kanniappan and S. Pandian, "On Generalized B-vexity in non-linear programming Duality", International Journal of Management and System, Vol. 13, P. 115-124.
- 8.. Suneja, S.K. and Gupta, S. (1994), "Duality in non-linear programming involving semilocally B-vex and related functions", Journal of Information and Optimization Sciences, 15 (1), 137-151, OPSEARCH 27 (1990), 239-253.
- 9. T. Weir and B. Mond, "Preinvex functions in multiple objective optimization, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 136 (1988), 29-38.
- 10. Varalaksmi G. and P.R.S. (Reddy) (2005): "Duality in multi-objective fractional programming problem involving semilocally b-vexity and related functions, Vision 2020, Re stratigic role of Operational Research.